

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Original claims 14–29 (presently claims 13–28) have been amended to address the objection that the claim numbering was incorrect (claim 13 was missing in the original filing).

Claims 1–4 and 6–9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by Tanaka (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0068642). As to claim 1, the Office Action states that Tanaka teaches encoded multimedia display commands including a command type code and an operation code (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Tanaka fail to teach the use of, *inter alia*, a command type code. Rather, Tanaka appears to teach using a voluminous set of operation codes (e.g., “asl,” “faslvw,” “aslp,” etc.), where each operation code corresponds to a particular instruction for the processor to execute. (Tanaka, FIGS. 29–32, ¶ [0183]: “‘Instruction’ indicates the operation code of an operation.”). At best, the cited portion of Tanaka appears to teach using different operation codes based on whether the processor is to perform a single or SIMD operation. (Tanaka, ¶ [0183]: “‘SIMD’ indicates the type of an instruction (distinction between SISD (SINGLE) and SIMD)”). For example, with respect to FIG. 31 and Tables 3–5 of Tanaka, the operation code “asl” represents the instruction “Shift Instruction1” for a single type instruction while the operation code “vasl” represents the instruction “SIMD shift instruction2” for a SIMD type instruction (Tanaka, Tables 3–5, FIG. 31).

Conversely, the present disclosure teaches encoded multimedia display commands including both an operation code *and* a command type code. For example, the present disclosure teaches “the encoded multimedia display command including a command type code and an operation code, wherein the command type code is utilized to determine if the encoded multimedia display command is at least one of the following: a type_zero command and a type_one command ...” (Aleksic, ¶ [0037]). Thus, the command type code in the present

disclosure indicates whether the encoded multimedia display command is a type_zero command “suited for longer data transfer” or a type_one command which “provide[s] for shorter data transfer thereby reducing overhead for shorter or common transfers” (Aleksic, ¶¶ [0046] and [0050]). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2–4 and 6–9 are allowable on at least depending upon an allowable base claim and are further believed to add additional novel, non-obvious, and patentable subject matter.

Original claims 10, 15–18, and 22–24 (presently claims 10, 14–17, and 21–23) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ralston et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0218482). As to claim 10 and original claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits that Ralston is an improper reference to form the basis of a § 102(e) rejection because the cited portion of the Ralston CIP application was disclosed *after* the filing date of the present disclosure. Applicant has submitted an IDS along with this response listing the applications from which Ralston claims priority. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to verify Applicant’s finding as to the cited matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejections of claim 10 and original claim 17. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 and original claim 17 are in condition for allowance.

Original claims 15–16, 18, and 22–24 are allowable on at least depending upon an allowable base claim and are further believed to add additional novel, non-obvious, and patentable subject matter.

Original claims 11–12, 19–20 and 25–29 (presently claims 11–12, 18–19, and 24–28) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston in view of Tanaka. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks above regarding the impropriety of the Ralston reference in forming the basis of a § 103(a) rejection. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of original claims 11–12, 19–20 and 25–29 and submits that those claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that original dependent claims 11–12, 19–20 and 26–29 are allowable on at least depending upon an allowable base claim and are further believed to add additional novel, non-obvious, and patentable subject matter.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of Lee (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0117585). As to claim 5, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks regarding claim 1 and submits that claim 5 is allowable for at least depending upon claim 1 and is further believed to add additional novel, non-obvious, and patentable subject matter.

Original claims 14 and 21 (presently claims 13 and 20) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ralston in view of Lee. As to original claims 14 and 21, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks above regarding the impropriety of the Ralston reference in forming the basis of a § 103(a) rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of original claims 14 and 21. Furthermore, Applicant submits that original claims 14 and 21 are allowable on at least depending upon an allowable base claim and are further believed to add additional novel, non-obvious, and patentable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 24, 2009

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7599
fax: (312) 609-5005